

EQUAL RIGHTS

Vol. 33, No. 5

SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER, 1947



Another Governor Endorses The Equal Rights Amendment



THE LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS
SERIAL RECORD

JAN 16 1948

Copy
Acting Governor Rennebohm of Wisconsin presents his letter of endorsement to Miss Mabel E. Griswold, Wisconsin State Chairman and National Secretary of the National Woman's Party, and Mrs. Edna K. Lundy, chairman of the Madison Business and Professional Women's Clubs' Equal Rights Amendment Committee.

A Call To Action On Equal Rights Amendment

From the Congressional Chairmen of the National Woman's Party

THE SECOND REGULAR SESSION of the 80th Congress will open on January 5th and again the Equal Rights Amendment will be to the fore. We send this call to our members to ask them to consolidate the gains that were made in the first session and to do all in their power to assure the final victory in the coming year.

If, as a Nation, we would make true our stand for equality and justice, we must establish equality of rights for women in the United States Constitution, the highest law of our land. Discriminatory laws are out of line with the principles we prize. The Equal Rights Amendment states a principle which should be embodied in our Constitution:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

The President of the United States has declared for the Equal Rights Amendment. He gave his endorsement in 1945 to a delegation headed by your two Congressional Chairmen, and he has always continued steadfast in his support.

Both major political parties have affirmed, in clear and unmistakable platform planks, their support. The Republican Party pledged in its 1944 platform: "We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women." The Democratic Party pledged in its 1944 platform: "We recommend to Congress the submission of a Constitutional amendment on equal rights for women."

The new Democratic National Chairman, Senator J. Howard McGrath, has just reaffirmed his endorsement

of the Amendment. Mr. Carroll Reese, Republican National Chairman, was a sponsor of the Amendment in the House of Representatives before he became the Republican National Chairman and his backing of the Amendment has been unfailing.

Over thirty State Governors have made public statements expressing their support. The most recent of the gubernatorial endorsements comes from Governor Rennebohm of Wisconsin: It reads:

"It has been long recognized in the State of Wisconsin that women should have equal rights with men. It is my earnest conviction that there should never be discrimination shown between people because of sex. For this reason I am for the proposed Equal Rights Amendment."

Senator Arthur Capper (R) of Kansas, and Representative John M. Robsion (R) of Kentucky, ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, introduced the Amendment in their respective Houses during the first session of the present Congress. Senator Capper in introducing the measure declared: "I earnestly hope that as your Chief Sponsor in the Senate, I may be able to bring the campaign to a victorious conclusion." Representative Robsion has repeatedly expressed his desire to lead the Amendment to victory in the present Congress.

Altogether 11 members of the Senate and 101 members of the House of Representatives joined with Senator Capper and Representative Robsion in sponsoring the Amendment on its introduction in the first session of this present Congress, making 114 sponsors in all. Everything gained in the first session carries

(Continued on Page 20)



EQUAL RIGHTS

Official Organ of the
NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
Capitol Hill Washington 2, D. C.
Published Bi-Monthly at
144 B Street, N. E., Washington 2, D. C.

Entered as second class matter at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879

Subscription \$1.50 a Year
Foreign Subscription, \$2.00

ANNE CARTER Editor
DORA G. OGLE Business Manager

National Chairman.....Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
1st Vice Chairman.....Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio
2nd Vice Chairman.....Margaret C. Williams, Conn.
3rd Vice Chairman.....Marie Moore Forrest, D. C.
Secretary.....Mabel E. Griswold, Wis.
Treasurer.....Gladys Houston Greiner, Md.
Assistant to the Treasurer.....Florence E. Kennard, Md.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Nina Horton, Avery, Va. Emma Guffey Miller, Pa.
Cecl Norton Broy, Va. Jane Norman Smith, Vt.
Lucretia Hayden Burwell, Cal. Amelia Himes Walker, Md.
Anne Carter, Texas Dr. Agnes E. Wells, Mich.
Lucia Hanna Hadley, Ind.
Alice Paul, N. J., Chairman World Woman's Party

NATIONAL COUNCIL

(Elected and Appointed Members, Past National Chairmen, and Chairmen of Occupational Councils, in addition to those on Executive Council.)

Ethel Adamson, N. J. Mamie Sydney Mizen, Wyo.
Dr. Mary Sinclair Crawford, Cal. Mary A. Murray, N. Y.
Elizabeth Forbes, Md. Ernestine Breisch Powell, Ohio
Virginia Starr Freedom, Md. Evelyn K. Samras, Fla.
Elsie Hill, Cal. Dr. Alma Jane Speer, D. C.
Miriam Y. Holden, N. J. Betty Gram Swing, Conn.
Dr. Zelma Huxtable, Cal. Helen Hunt West, Fla.
Alice Kachadourian, Md. Florence Laynor Wheatley, Md.
Grace Cook Kurz, N. Y. Naomi Wheeler, D. C.
Marion May, N. Y. Lucy Rice Winkler, Cal.

TEXT OF EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect three years after the date of ratification."

Introduced in Senate February 21, 1947.

Introduced in House January 9, 1947.

Referred to Judiciary Committee in each House.

At present before both sub-committees.

This double number of Equal Rights was made necessary by circumstances beyond our control.

"Take Up The Song—Forget The Epitaph"

We go to press with a feeling of profound gratitude that our organization has weathered the storm of the past year, and that our legally elected officers are upheld in their position by a court of law.

Our gratitude, however, is deeply tinged with sorrow that the suit was ever brought. No one could have spent even a few hours in the quiet, tense courtroom without an oppressive sense of tragedy. Tragic was the waste of time and energy and money when victory for the Amendment was so near. More tragic was the realization that a group famous for 35 years for its unity and driving singleness of purpose, was divided. And—supreme irony—divided by the will of so few.

But some good has come of this tragedy. Our members, astounded and affronted by the attack on their officers, came to the defense of our organization with soul-satisfying determination. Some, who had been more or less passive for years, were roused to action and a realization that the equality cause needs more than their names on a membership card. Now we can put this reawakened energy to work for the Amendment.

To Members of the National Woman's Party:

December 15, 1947.

As we go to press the news reaches us that today, December 15, Justice Proctor signed the Judgment in the law suit that has been before the Court since last February. This Judgment is in accordance with the Memorandum Opinion given by Justice Proctor on November 21, which appears in this issue. The Judgment by Justice Proctor sustains the position taken by your Officers and National Council on every point at issue. This suit is now ended, unless those who brought the suit should appeal.

The Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia handed down today, December 15, a decision in the injunction suit filed last March to enjoin the Officers, National Council, and others from closing the Headquarters to certain members who had endeavored to take over the Headquarters, seal of the organization, records and property, by force and without authorization. The lower Court decided that it could not consider the case because of lack of jurisdiction. The Court of Appeals now rules that the lower Court had jurisdiction, and sends the case back to that Court to dispose of as it sees fit. In the meantime the whole question has become an academic one as the Headquarters has been open to everyone since last April, the emergency that had necessitated the closing of the Headquarters having then come to an end. There would seem, therefore, to be nothing for the lower Court to consider.

(Signed)

ANITA POLLITZER,
National Chairman.

CLARA SNELL WOLFE,
1st Vice-Chairman.

MARGARET C. WILLIAMS,
2nd Vice-Chairman.

MARIE MOORE FORREST,
3rd Vice-Chairman.

MABEL E. GRISWOLD,
National Secretary.

GLADYS HOUSTON GREINER,
National Treasurer.

Letters From Coast To Coast

Editor's note—As soon as news of the decision in our favor reached our members, joyful messages of congratulation and thanksgiving began to pour in to Headquarters. We wish we could share all of them with you, but space forbids, even in this small type. Here are a few of the first to arrive:

From California—Mrs. William Kent, Kentfield, Life Member of the National Woman's Party:

"Grateful congratulations to all who so ably conducted our defense. Loving greetings."

From Arkansas—Miss Aurelle Burnside, El Dorado, Chairman, Arkansas Branch:

"It is heartening to know that Justice Proctor on November 21 rendered judgment for the defendants in the action involving our National Woman's Party. I realize that the very pendency of the suit was a most disturbing influence and a burden of magnitude. I want to congratulate you all on the manner and the spirit in which you have handled this litigation and the part you have played in saving the National Woman's Party for that destiny which brought it into being."

From New York City—Mrs. Elizabeth S. Rogers, Life Member of National Woman's Party:

"Yesterday came the Judge's Memo Opinion, which I have read over and over with the greatest joy. My love to all our faithful workers who have been so splendid through these awful times."

From Wyoming—Mrs. H. H. Horton, Laramie, Northwest Regional Chairman:

"Your letter, today received, brought the good news of the Court victory, and I hasten to say how happy I am. My congratulations and good wishes."

From South Carolina—Susan Pringle Frost, Chairman, South Carolina Branch:

"I have been with you heart and soul. I knew that right must prevail."

(Continued on Page 19)

Our Own Pilgrim's Progress

By AMELIA HIMES WALKER

Lobby Chairman, National Woman's Party

Hopes are high for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment during the 80th Congress, but many "sloughs of despond" are still clogging our path. As we plod through one "slough" on our upward climb we find ourselves caught in the mire of another that seems to have bubbled up over night.

It was in February, 1947, during the first session of the present Congress, that Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas introduced the Equal Rights Amendment in the Senate. His resolution was given the title S. J. Res. 76. Mark that well, for it is so easily confused with the Taft-Wadsworth bill which was also introduced in the first session and was given the number S. J. Res. 67.

The Taft-Wadsworth bill constitutes our present "slough of despond." It is a threat to the advancement of women and to the Equal Rights Amendment and as such should be studied by every member of the National Woman's Party. On its face it appears to promise equality, it appears to agree with the Equal Rights Amendment. It reads:

"it is the declared policy of the United States that in law and its administration no distinctions on the basis of sex shall be made."

So far, so good. But immediately following is a qualifying section reading:

"except such distinctions as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structures, or biological or social function."

The Taft-Wadsworth bill pretends to give women equal rights, but in reality it was introduced, we believe, for the purpose of defeating the Equal Rights Amendment.

The Taft-Wadsworth bill was referred in each House to the Judiciary Committee. The Senate Judiciary referred it to a sub-committee of which Senator For-

rest C. Donnell (R) of Missouri is Chairman. The House Judiciary has not sent it to a sub-committee.

"Have you studied the Taft-Wadsworth bill?" we ask each Congressman on our lobby visits. "No, I haven't had time."

"Then let us look at this copy, please. It is a bill to retard the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment," we explain. "It would allow blanket distinctions against all women on account of differences in physical structure or biological or social function. All women could be discriminated against by the enactment of such a law."

The innate gallantry of many Congressmen prompts them to support the Taft-Wadsworth bill because it has the appearance of protecting women. These Congressmen are astonished when they learn that "no night-work" laws for women often work a hardship upon women because day-work is not available to provide women workers with bread and butter. They are puzzled by the fact that under the "no night-work" laws a girl who is supporting an aged parent by waiting on a table is forbidden to earn money as a waitress after ten o'clock but may sit down at a table after ten and be treated to a drink by a man patron. They are baffled by the fact that minimum wage and maximum hour laws applying to women but not to their male competitors often cause an employer to dismiss women employees in favor of less law-controlled men workers.

It is to be hoped that the Taft-Wadsworth bill will not throw powder in the eyes of legislators who earnestly desire to raise the standard of equal justice within the country they love and serve. It is to be hoped that women will study the Taft-Wadsworth bill and oppose it before it gains sufficient backing to constitute a real peril to the Equal Rights Amendment. We must take every precaution against this new "slough" and see that the cause of equality for women is not entrapped by it and does not sink in it.

Letters From Coast To Coast (Continued)

From New York City—Mrs. Ambrose N. Diehl, President, National Council of Women of the United States:

"Congratulations on your victory. We, of the National Council of Women of the United States, are delighted with this news. We all know how hard you have worked, and we feel sure that you can now continue your fine work without interruption."

From New York City—Mrs. Lillian A. Lilly, Parliamentarian of the National Woman's Party:

"Love and congratulations. So glad of the outcome. I felt it could not be otherwise."

From New Jersey—Mrs. George Vickers, Jersey City, Secretary-Treasurer of New Jersey Branch:

"Of course right had to triumph, but sometimes it takes even longer than it took this time!"

From Illinois—Mrs. Nina E. Allender, Chicago, one of the first members of the Woman's Party and long a member of the National Council:

"All of these years loyal and indefatigable Woman's Party members have been working for women, watching every political trick, national and international complications—and then suddenly—without warning—this suit in open court, against women who had worked for women through two wars and never lost the dream! Out here, I have relived our history—but I have never doubted the outcome."

From New York City—Mrs. Thomas G. Evans, Treasurer, National Council of Women of the United States:

"Congratulations. This victory is a tribute to your leadership. The triumph of right and of decency helps all of us."

From Virginia—Mrs. Nina Horton Avery, Richmond, Chairman, Women's Joint Legislative Committee, and Southeast Regional Chairman of the Woman's Party:

"Profound relief over our victory and our deepest gratitude for your supreme effort."

From Pennsylvania—Miss Caroline Katzenstein, Philadelphia, Executive Secretary of Philadelphia Branch of National Woman's Party during the suffrage campaign:

"Hearty congratulations and every good wish. May good luck follow your future work. You deserve the gratitude of women everywhere."

From Michigan—Dr. Agnes E. Wells, Saginaw, Member, National Executive Council:

"What a Thanksgiving Day this will be. The Cause can now occupy our undivided attention. I congratulate you all on your wonderful work, leading to this great success."

From Florida—Mrs. Sophie Kenyon, Palm Beach, Active leader in Minnesota in the suffrage campaign:

"The good news came yesterday. It was such a relief that the tears came. I made a pledge, I think it was for \$50, but I feel like celebrating and am enclosing \$100. All hail to the victory—and the victorious."

From New York City—Judge Anna M. Kross, City Magistrate:

"I was thrilled when Evelyn Baker Richman told me of the successful outcome of the suit. Perhaps some good will come out of all the travail that you and your loyal workers of the Woman's Party went through. We'll all plunge in with renewed enthusiasm to put the Amendment through in the next Congress. With best of good wishes."

From Committee On Information Of National Woman's Party

November 25, 1947.

Dear Reader of Equal Rights:

Most of you know of the law suit that was brought last February against our officers and National Council by a small insurgent group, which sought to have declared legal a Rump convention held January 10 and 11, 1947, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, when a new slate of officers was allegedly elected. It is my privilege on behalf of our Committee on Information to tell you that the litigation has ended in a complete vindication of the position taken by your duly elected officers and National Council.

This past year has been difficult and at times disheartening. It is deeply regrettable that this small group saw fit to involve our organization in litigation. With sorrow we were forced to defend the organization in Court.

Those of us who are attorneys were convinced from the start of the moral soundness and of the legal validity of the position taken by our officers and Council. The result has entirely justified our confidence. Mr. Justice James M. Proctor decided the case completely in favor of the incumbent officers and Council. In his memorandum handed down November 21, 1947, in referring to the action of the insurgents, he stated, in part:

" * * * It follows that the efforts * * * to hold a convention January 10 and 11 in Washington were invalid and all action taken by that gathering was void. Accordingly, those persons now claiming the offices of the National Woman's Party by action of that meeting are without lawful right or title to support their claims * * *,"

You can be justly proud of the part that many of you have played in this victory for orderly and constitutional procedure.

We owe a deep debt of gratitude to our officers and members who so loyally fought for the preservation of our Party, to those who at great personal sacrifice stayed in Washington at long intervals, to those who came to Washington repeatedly to work on the case, and to those who came to Washington to testify for us. Particularly do we owe it to

Our gallant National Chairman, Anita Pollitzer, who courageously and indefatigably has met with patience and skill the many difficult situations imposed upon us;

Our Founder, Alice Paul, who has brought to this crucial ordeal, her wisdom, her rare ability and devotion.

Our Lawyer, Olive B. Lacy, who with sound judgment and painstaking work, won our case with the able collaboration of Judge John M. Connaughton, Albert Conrads, Judge Albert Levitt, and Naomi Wheeler, lawyers for different Defendants and Interveners.

Please give the good news of the outcome of the suit to those in your locality. Then let us tackle the work for the coming session of Congress, with gratitude, with unity, and with zeal.

Faithfully yours,

EVELYN BAKER RICHMAN
Chairman, Committee on Information.

A Call To Action On Equal Rights Amendment (Continued)

over into the second session so that we enter the second session with the unprecedented number of 114 sponsors in the two Houses.

At the present moment the Equal Rights Amendment is before the two Judiciary Committees. The members of the Senate Judiciary Committee are:

Republicans—Alexander Wiley, *Wis.*, Chairman; William Langer, *N. D.*; Homer Ferguson, *Mich.*; Chapman Revercomb, *W. Va.*; E. H. Moore, *Okl.*; Forrest C. Donnell, *Mo.*; John Sherman Cooper, *Ky.*

Democrats—Pat McCarran, *Nev.*; Harley M. Kilgore, *W. Va.*; James O. Eastland, *Miss.*; Warren G. Magnuson, *Wash.*; J. W. Fulbright, *Ark.*; J. Howard McGrath, *R. I.*

The members of the House Judiciary Committee are:

Republicans—Earl C. Michener, *Mich.*, Chairman; John M. Robison, *Ky.*; Chauncey W. Reed, *Ill.*; John W. Gwynne, *Iowa*; Louis E. Graham, *Penna.*; Frank Fellows, *Maine*; Earl R. Lewis, *Ohio*; John Jennings, Jr., *Tenn.*; Angier L. Goodwin, *Mass.*; Clifford P. Case, *N. J.*; E. Wallace Chadwick, *Pa.*; Albert L. Reeves, Jr., *Mo.*; Kenneth B. Keating, *N. Y.*; Edward J. Devitt, *Minn.*

Democrats—Emanuel Celler, *N. Y.*; Francis E. Walter, *Pa.*; Sam Hobbs, *Ala.*; William T. Byrne, *N. Y.*; Estes Kefauver, *Tenn.*; Joseph R. Bryson, *S. C.*; Fadjo Cravens, *Ark.*; Thomas J. Lane, *Mass.*; Martin Gorski, *Ill.*; Michael A. Feighan, *Ohio*; Frank L. Chelf, *Ky.*; Ed. Gossett, *Texas*.

The first work before us is to make sure that these two committees act favorably, and immediately. Both committees, it will be remembered reported the Amendment favorably in the last Congress. The personnel of the two committees is largely the same as in

the last Congress, so it is to be expected that both committees will report favorably again.

Many of our State groups are informing us that their entire delegations are pledged solidly, or almost solidly, to the Amendment. For instance, Mrs. Helen Vanderburg, member of the Republican State Central Committee of Iowa and Chairman of the Iowa Branch of the National Woman's Party, sends the following word:

"Both Senators and 7 members of the Iowa Delegation in the Congress stand back of the Equal Rights Amendment. The women of Iowa support their representatives in this position and urge them to brook no delay in the passage of the Amendment. The adoption of this measure by Congress in this period of subversive infiltration will strengthen our Republic."

Mrs. Clarence Smith, Vermont State Chairman, writes:

"The entire Vermont delegation in Congress have declared themselves in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment. Women of Vermont are writing their representatives to say that there is no more important measure awaiting action by Congress."

Senators and Congressmen should be interviewed while they are at home during the Christmas holidays. Please send us word of their replies so that we may know upon whom we may count.

ALICE GUYER,
EMMA GUFFEY MILLER,
National Woman's Party,
Congressional Co-Chairmen,

Statement To Members

By MABEL E. GRISWOLD, *Secretary of the National Woman's Party*, and
MAMIE SIDNEY MIZEN, *Secretary pro-tem of the National Council*

IT is good to be able to report that the law suit (Civil Action 530-47) in which the National Woman's Party has been involved since last February has resulted in the complete vindication of the position taken by the Officers and Council—your Officers and Council—whom you duly elected at the Biennial Convention of 1945. This is now permanently a matter of record. The opinion rendered by Justice James M. Proctor in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia on November 21, 1947, is given elsewhere in this issue of *Equal Rights*. It is given in full so that our membership may have the complete finding by the Court.

It may have been a source of speculation, not to say concern, to many of you as to why *Equal Rights* did not carry more statements during the bitter and arduous days of the law suit, whose close brought us this victory. Devotion to the ideals of the National Woman's Party, and to the cause of the advancement of women, forbade our publicizing, except under necessity, this one break in our unity of thirty-five years. *Equal Rights* carried two reports, this will be the third, and we earnestly hope the last that the paper need ever carry.

HISTORY OF THE CASE

Lest we forget the strange events in this unprecedented attempt upon the solidarity, even the existence of the National Woman's Party, it is well to recapitulate them. For some readers it may be the first time the complete story has reached them.

In New York, on September 28, 1946, the National Council of the National Woman's Party decided to hold the next Biennial Convention in Washington in January, 1947, the exact date in January to be fixed later by the National Chairman and officers. The date of January 25-26 was chosen by your National Chairman, the three Vice-Chairmen, the Treasurer and the Convention Chairman. An official call for that date went to the membership, and was published in the September-October, 1946, issue of *Equal Rights*.

Then began the bizarre series of events which culminated in the recent court action in which the officers and Council were sustained by the present court decision.

UNAUTHORIZED CONVENTION CALL

First, there was issued another call to a convention, not for January 25-26, 1947, but for January 10-12, 1947. All this was without the knowledge of the National Chairman and without the knowledge of most of the members of the National Council. The call was printed in a so-called "supplement" to *Equal Rights*, which was in reality an unauthorized edition of *Equal Rights*, sent out without the knowledge of the National Chairman, the Business Manager, or the official printer of the magazine. This second, unauthorized call, even went so far as to cancel in effect the previously properly called convention.

At a loss to explain this action of a small group who chose to become insurgents against the regularly elected officers, the National Chairman summoned to Washington the National Executive Council, for a meeting on November 24, 1946. Then it was decided to call a meeting of the whole National Council on December 15 at Indianapolis. Both of these groups voted not to recognize the so-called "convention" called for January

10, 11 and 12, 1947. Realizing, too, the confusion in the minds of members who had received two calls for two different conventions in January, the Indianapolis meeting of the National Council decided unanimously to change the convention date to April 12 and 13, 1947, and the place from Washington to Chicago. That would permit more Western and Mid-Western members to attend, and teachers who might be free in Easter holidays.

THE RUMP CONVENTION

Then, on January 10, 11, 12, 1947—days long to be remembered by the National Woman's Party—came the "Rump" convention. There, despite the protests of the duly chosen officers and Council members, this so-called convention "elected" a slate of officers who thereupon claimed to be officers of the Party. Members are already familiar with the statements made by nearly all the State chairmen telling of the non-participation of their respective groups in the alleged convention.

COUNCIL RESOLVES TO PROTECT THE ORGANIZATION

The National Council met at Headquarters in continuous session on January 9. There were grim hours. These women saw the work of 35 years for equality, so near completion, threatened with destruction. They met again January 10, again the 11th, the 12th. They came out of these sessions resolved to use every legal means to protect the organization that had been entrusted to them. That was the beginning of months of gruelling work and wearing anxiety. Crisis followed crisis swiftly.

THE ULTIMATUM

On January 21, 1947, came an ultimatum to the National Council demanding that the officers and Council turn over the organization, its headquarters, property, and funds to the group that had held the so-called convention January 10, 11, 12, and threatening a law suit against the officers and Council unless they did so. The ultimatum was transmitted by Mr. Spencer Gordon and Mr. Charles A. Horsky of the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb of Washington, to the attorney for the National Woman's Party, Miss Olive Lacy. It was not clear from whom the ultimatum came, nor who had authorized it.

On January 23, 1947, Mr. Horsky telephoned to Miss Lacy that unless complete abdication took place within a week a suit would be filed in Court against the incumbent officers and Council.

On January 25, 1947, Anita Pollitzer, National Chairman of the National Woman's Party, wrote the National Council, asking the members to meet in Washington on January 28 to consider the ultimatum. Her letter to the Council read:

"Concerning the attack being made upon us as an organization, the attorneys on both sides have met, and the result is that the following proposition must be decided by you as members of the Council:—Whether to let the opposing group move into Headquarters, direct the work, and take charge of the funds for a period of two years, or (2) face possibly prolonged and expensive litigation, which may be brought against us individually and collectively and tie up indefinitely the work and funds of the Party at this crucial time in the history of the Amendment.

"The attorneys have agreed on a short suspension of the legal action which our opponents threaten to bring

almost immediately. Our Counsel has agreed that our answer will be given by Thursday.

"Each of us is asked to consider carefully which course is in the best interests of our cause, and which will be least damaging to the work. We cite the alternatives briefly so that you can weigh carefully the need for coming to cast your vote. . . . I have checked this letter with our attorney, who suggested that I write you as I have done.

"We have done everything within these months in efforts for mediation. Up to tonight we have tried.

"Sincerely,

"ANITA POLLITZER
"Chairman."

On January 26 came a meeting of the so-called "Executive Council" of the insurgents. The minutes of this meeting, which came into our hands only recently, disclose that this meeting voted to engage the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb and to authorize the suit against the incumbent Officers and Council. Ten women only were present, according to the minutes. These ten women must bear the responsibility for having plunged the Woman's Party and the woman movement into a law suit that has wracked the organization for months and has made almost impossible any real progress in the equality campaign.

The strange fact should here be noted that the January 26 meeting of the insurgents' "Executive Council," at which the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb was engaged and at which the suit was authorized, took place *after* representatives of this firm had delivered their ultimatum. We do not know, to the present writing, who caused the ultimatum of January 21 and 23 to be sent, nor who was back of it.

NATIONAL COUNCIL REJECTS ULTIMATUM

Again the National Council met—January 28 through February 2, 1947. No one who was not present can know the earnestness and the concern for the future of the National Woman's Party, and for the cause to which it is dedicated. Not once was there the note of personal concern. The grave question was what to do in the face of this demand to abdicate. The decision was not long in coming. On January 29, Mrs. Elizabeth Forbes of Baltimore put the resolution to refuse to meet the demand. This was unanimously carried as follows:

"WHEREAS, we, the members of the National Council of the National Woman's Party, have made every effort to settle any differences which have recently arisen within the Party, and

"WHEREAS, our attempts at mediation and conciliation have met with no response on the part of the opposition, and

"WHEREAS, we, the elected officers and members of the National Council of the National Woman's Party, are trustees of the spiritual and material assets of the National Woman's Party,

"THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we refuse to accept the unjust and illegal demands of a small group of women who held a so-called convention at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 10, 11, 12, 1947, to which a majority of our State organizations refused to send delegates, and who are now demanding that we surrender to them the name, property and funds of the National Woman's Party, which it is not legally or morally in our power to do."

The rest of the session was spent in planning to meet what might come.

THE SUIT IS FILED

The waiting was not long. On February 5, 1947, the suit that had been threatened was filed in the District Court, surely one of the strangest suits ever filed there. For the insurgents even called themselves "The National Woman's Party" and labeled the defendants "Anita Pollitzer, et al." What an honor roll that "et

al" turned out to be. It reads like a roster of the greatest friends of the woman movement. It is hard to overestimate the caliber of those women in the list below who constitute the "defendants" in this suit. Here they are: Anita Pollitzer (S. C.), National Chairman; Clara Snell Wolfe (Ohio), 1st Vice-Chairman and Chairman of the Ohio Branch; Margaret C. Williams (Conn.), 2nd Vice-Chairman; Gladys Houston Greiner (Md.), Treasurer; Marie Moore Forrest (D. C.), 3rd Vice-Chairman; Cecil Norton Broy (Va.), Political Chairman; Emma Guffey Miller (Pa.), Congressional Chairman; Jane Norman Smith (Vt.), former National Chairman; Amelia Himes Walker (Md.), Lobby Chairman; Dr. Agnes E. Wells (Mich.), member National Council; Alice Morgan Wright (N. Y.), member National Council; Alice Paul (N. J.), Founder of the Woman's Party and former National Chairman; Ethel M. Adamson (N. J.), member National Council; Nina Horton Avery (Va.), member National Council and Vice-President of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; Dr. Mary Sinclair Crawford (Cal.), Western Regional Chairman and member National Council; Edith J. Goode (Vt.), member National Council; Elsie M. Hill (Cal.), former National Chairman; Miriam Y. Holden (N. Y.), member National Council; Dr. Zelma L. Huxtable (Cal.), member National Council; Florence E. Kennard (Md.), Assistant Treasurer and member National Council; Marion May (N. Y.), member of Investment and Endowment Committee and member National Council; Mary A. Murray (N. Y.), Chairman Industrial Council and member National Council; Betty Gram Swing (Conn.), Northeastern Regional Chairman and member National Council; Helen Hunt West (Fla.), former Editor of *Equal Rights* and member National Council; Lucy Rice Winkler (Cal.), Southwest Regional Chairman and member National Council; Elizabeth Forbes (Md.), member National Council; Grace Cook Kurz (N. Y.), Organization Chairman and member National Council; Lucia Hanna Hadley (Ind.), member National Council.

And here follows the gist of the insurgents' demands as taken from the Complaint filed in the Court:

"That the defendants and their agents and employees be directed to surrender to plaintiff corporation and to its duly elected officers, the Headquarters of the corporation, the seal and the records of the corporation, and that the defendants be ordered to cooperate in making any and all bank accounts and funds of the corporation available to the plaintiff corporation and to its duly elected officers and Councils, and the defendants be enjoined from interfering with said officers and Councils in the conduct of their duties as such."

Next came days and nights of marshals at the door of the lovely old Headquarters, of marshals seeking out members even at the places of their employment, at homes of friends, to serve papers upon them. Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, sister of former Senator Guffey of Pennsylvania, was the first to be so served. Mrs. Lucia Hanna Hadley, the daughter of former Congressman Hanna of Indiana, was next. Mrs. Marie Moore Forrest, daughter of Commodore Moore, was the third. The three voiced the sentiments of the whole group when they repeated their whole-hearted determination to see the affair through and never to waver in their stand.

It is easy now to laugh over the tense moments of those nights when the women at the Headquarters waited for what might come. The Headquarters was forcibly entered. Then there was no laughter. The women became convinced that something was moving

against them bigger and more alarming than just a few insurgents. But what? This is one of the still unanswered questions.

SECOND SUIT FILED

In March, 1947, a second suit was filed by the attacking group (Civil Action 1121-47). This was an injunction suit to prevent the Officers, National Council and others from closing the Headquarters to a few members who had, without authorization, endeavored to take possession of the Headquarters and property of the organization. The injunction suit was brought against the National Officers and Council as in the first suit, and in addition ten others were named as defendants. They were Dora Ogle, Business Manager of *Equal Rights*; Dorothy Spinks, Secretary of the Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights; Mary E. Owens, Chairman of the North Dakota Branch of the National Woman's Party; Phoebe Munnecke, Chairman of the Michigan Branch; Mabel E. Griswold, Chairman of the Wisconsin Branch; Olive Beale, Secretary at National Headquarters; Claire Wadden, Bookkeeper at National Headquarters; Rose Williams, Maid at National Headquarters; Monroe Hunter, Watchman at National Headquarters; Samuel L. Mills, Houseman at National Headquarters.

On May 13, 1947, the District Court dismissed the Injunction suit for lack of jurisdiction. Our opponents then carried the case to the Court of Appeals. On December 15, 1947, the Court of Appeals handed down the decision that the lower Court had jurisdiction and returned the case to the lower Court so that the case is now back again where it was when it was first filed in March 1947. The merits of the case have never been before the Court; only the question of the Court's jurisdiction. In the meantime the question has become a moot one since the Headquarters has been open for a long time and no one has been excluded.

ATTEMPTS TO ADJUST DIFFICULTIES

During these weeks, and in the months that followed, Alice Paul, as Founder of the National Woman's Party, made continuous efforts to heal the breach. The National Chairman, Miss Pollitzer, and other Council members joined in this effort. But they were working in the dark. They did not know why this thing had been done. They could not find out. Precious time that should have had no claim upon it but work to get the Amendment through Congress had to be taken to try to prevent the Party's being haled into court. The efforts were unavailing. And still worse, the officers did not know who it was they must placate. Certainly a few were known. But the others? For it was claimed that there were many others. It was like fighting wisps of tangling cobwebs. Even the names of those who had participated in the so-called convention of January 10, 11, 12 were not known. Only at the Court trial months later, were these names finally disclosed.

Still the efforts to settle out of Court went on. Here follows a list of some of our peace proposals made last summer:

1. Insurgents to drop law suits and withdraw from the National Woman's Party, forming a new society to work for the Amendment, and any other object as they might desire;
2. Insurgents to withdraw from the National Woman's Party forming a new society to work for the Amendment, and any other object as they might desire; the law suit filed February 5, 1947, to be heard in Court in the October term, for the determination of property rights;
3. Insurgents to drop law suits, and everyone involved

in present controversy, on both sides, to agree not to allow her name to be presented for office at coming Biennial Convention, so that officers and Council chosen at coming Convention would not be connected with present controversy;

4. Insurgents to drop law suits, and Nominating Committee for coming Biennial Convention to present a slate to the Convention that would be satisfactory to both sides in controversy, this slate to be supported in the Convention by both sides;
5. Insurgents to drop law suits, and both sides in controversy to present its own ticket at coming Biennial Convention, and let the Convention decide.

But all was unavailing. The above proposals, as well as all others, were summarily rejected by the attacking group. Nothing was left but to face the trial.

CONVENTION PLANS

The National Convention scheduled for April, 1947, in Chicago, had been given up because of the two law suits against the Officers and Council. As spring drew into summer, work on the Amendment had to go on. It did. Under and through it all was the tension of waiting for the Court trial, the constant flow of inquiries, of answers, of planning, of searching for ways and means to carry on.

Then it was decided by the National Council to attempt to hold the Convention in October, 1947, at the expiration of the two-year term for which the incumbent officers and Council had been elected. The place was changed from Chicago to Madison, Wisconsin, because of the difficulty of securing accommodations in Chicago. Again there was the thought that the Middle and Far West would be benefited. The Call to the October Convention was a stirring one. It went out in August, 1947, coincidentally with a beautiful reception at the National Headquarters celebrating the Anniversary of the ratification of the Suffrage amendment.

INJUNCTION MOTION

But the hope for a Convention was not long lived. The attorneys for the insurgents filed a motion for an injunction, September 10, 1947. The injunction Motion asked that the defendants be enjoined from transferring the Headquarters, seal, records, et cetera, to any officers or Council members who might be elected at the convention. Here is a paragraph from the Motion:

"Plaintiff . . . moves the Court to enter an injunction pending the trial and final decision of this case, enjoining the defendants and each of them, and their agents, servants, employees, and attorneys from transferring to any person or persons the headquarters of the corporation, the seal and records of the corporation, and/or any bank accounts and funds of the corporation in the possession or control of the defendants or any of them."

That meant that, even if new officers were elected, they could not, if the injunction motion were granted, receive the records, use the headquarters, or carry on in any of the usual ways traditional in the Party. There was therefore no reason for going on with the convention plans, and it was voted by the National Council to postpone the Convention once more. Here are a few paragraphs from the postponement notice sent to the membership September 23, 1947:

"With regret, the Officers and Council of the National Woman's Party inform the members that it has been necessary to postpone, for the time being, the Biennial Convention called for October 3, 4, 5, 1947, at Madison, Wisconsin.

"We had been looking forward eagerly to this, our first post-war convention, and plans were practically completed. But when the time for the Convention was

(Continued on Page 26)

Evening Star

WITH SUNDAY MORNING EDITION

D. C., FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1947

LATE NEWS BULLETIN

Politzer Faction Wins Woman's Party Fight

A group headed by Miss Anita Pollitzer of New York constitutes the legal officers of the National Woman's Party, Justice James M. Proctor ruled this afternoon in District Court. His memorandum opinion decided against a slate headed by Mrs. John L. Whitehurst of Baltimore.

New York Herald
Tribune

Nov. 22, 1947

Miss Pollitzer Group Wins In Woman's Party Suit

WASHINGTON, Nov. 21 (AP).—Justice James M. Proctor in District Court ruled Friday that legal officers of the National Woman's party are headed by Miss Anita Pollitzer, of New York. His memorandum opinion decided against a group headed by Mrs. John L. Whitehurst, of Baltimore.

The ruling followed a ten-day court battle between two groups of the party resulting from dissension at a convention in January when a slate headed by Mrs. Whitehurst was elected. This group brought suit against the incumbent officers headed by Miss Pollitzer, whom they said refused to attend the convention, vacate headquarters here or surrender party funds.

Miss Pollitzer and twenty-six other officers named defendants in the suit said the January convention was called illegally.

THE NEWS AND COURIER,
CHARLESTON, S. C.

Miss Pollitzer Pleased Over Court Victory

(By a Special Correspondent)
WASHINGTON, Nov. 22: Miss Anita M. Pollitzer, of Charleston and Washington, chairman of the National Women's party, described Saturday as a "grand victory" the federal court decision in Washington that held her group the duly elected officers of the party over another group of women who had sought to take over.

Miss Pollitzer said, "on behalf of myself and the national council of the National Women's party, I wish to express the great relief and happiness we all feel as a result of Justice James M. Proctor's decision. The effort to oust the duly elected officers and members of the council by means of a coup d'etat has been prevented. This is a victory for orderly and constitutional procedure, and now we can go forward without further interference with the campaign for equality of women including our work for passage of the equal rights amendment—a measure that is on the brink of victory."

Equal Rights 'Rebels' Ask Equal Rights

By a Staff Correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

The National Woman's Party, long-time champion of equal rights for women, is having a little problem of equal rights among women.

An insurgent group has broken off from the organization and is attempting to wrest the control of the Party, its headquarters, and its funds from the present incumbents.

The rebel group even went so far recently as to stage an invasion by force into the Party headquarters, the Alva Belmont House on Capitol Hill from which they were persuaded to withdraw only after arrival of the police.

Mrs. Belmont, wealthy patron of the Party, who bequeathed to it her home, also left it ample funds for operation.

'Rebels' Seek Control

Control of these were sought by the dissidents. The bank, however, scenting trouble within the ranks, checked authorized signatures and refused to honor the claim of the new applicants.

All this came about as the Party councils met in national session at the Belmont House last week, while the insurgents flounced off to a meeting of their own at the Mayflower Hotel and elected new Party officers. The incumbents deny the "legality" of these elections.

The split has developed over interpretation of the purpose and scope of the Party.

The insurgents claim that the Party's only legitimate function is the promotion of the Equal Rights Amendment, and that it has no authority to dabble in the international field.

Opposite Viewpoint

The incumbents, headed by the Party's National Chairman, Miss Anita Pollitzer, and Party founder, Miss Alice Paul, take the broader view that while the Party's main concern is passage of the amendment, its interests appropriately include international aspects of equal rights for women, as well.

utes showed a legal New York meeting of the national council September 28, 1946, fixed the convention date for January, 1947, in Washington and the exact dates of January 25 and 26 were fixed by the chairman and officers. An overwhelming national executive council vote favored Dr. Agnes E. Wells University of Indiana dean, as the convention chairman, she said.

The plaintiffs want the court to rule a slate of officers elected last January in the Mayflower Hotel, headed by Mrs. John L. Whitehurst of Baltimore, is the legal one. The defense maintains that owing to the confusion caused by the "insurgents" setting convention dates of January 10, 11 and 12, the dates of January 25 and 26 were canceled. Later, the defense pointed out, a date in April was selected, but because of the lawsuit, that convention was not held. In accordance with the party constitution, however, the defendants maintain, Miss Pollitzer and her group were legally elected for two years.

EVENING STAR, Washin
SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1947.

Miss Pollitzer Faction Ruled Legal Officers Of Women's Party

A list of officers, headed by Miss Anita Pollitzer of New York, was recognized as the legal slate of the National Woman's Party by Justice James M. Proctor of District Court yesterday.

Justice Proctor yesterday ruled against the plaintiffs who had sought to establish the legality of the slate elected last January in the Mayflower Hotel and headed by Mrs. John L. Whitehurst of Baltimore.

Justice Proctor had taken the case under advisement on November 13 after a lengthy hearing.

The jurist ruled the Mayflower Hotel convention was called illegally. At the same time, he held that a convention slated by the Pollitzer group for the Mayflower later the same month was properly called. This convention was postponed to April, however.

The April convention also was canceled because of the controversy within the party.

Besides Miss Pollitzer, the others declared legal officers of the party include Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe, Columbus, Ohio, first vice chairman; Mrs. Margaret C. Williams, Kent, Conn., second vice chairman; Mrs. Randolph Keith Forrest, Washington, third vice chairman; Miss Mabel E. Griswold, Madison, Wis., secretary, and Miss Gladys Greiner, Baltimore, treasurer.

Miss Olive Lacey was chief counsel for the Pollitzer group.

Justice Proctor's decision gives the Pollitzer group authority to remain in control of the party's headquarters in the 100 block of B street N.E.

THE CAPITAL TIMES

Rules Women's Group Officers Legally Named

A slate of officers, including Mabel E. Griswold, Madison, secretary, was held to be the legal officials of the National Woman's party by Associate Justice James M. Proctor in a decision in district court at Washington, D. C., Nov. 21.

The group of officers held legal by the court is headed by Miss Anita Pollitzer, party chairman. The ruling climaxed a lengthy legal battle between the incumbents and an insurgent group known as the "Mayflower" faction.

—THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS, MONDAY, JANUARY



Just to R

FOR those who can't q
which in the Nation's
contingent is best describ
shown in session at the Mon

The National Council, National Women's Party

Left to Right, Front Row: Mrs. Arthur C. Hays Sulzberger, National Council; Miss Alice Paul, past National Council; Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Political Chairman; Mrs. Mary A. Murray, Ohio, 1st Vice-Chairman; Mrs. Lloyd Wilson, Hadley, Ind.

Standing: Miss Florence E. Kennard, Md., Treasurer; Mrs. Meta Grace Keebler, Alabama, Political Chairman; Mrs. Mary A. Murray, Ohio, 2nd Vice-Chairman.

Present at the meeting but not in photograph: Mrs. C. Kura, N. Y., Organization Chairman; Mrs. S.

These are samples of n

he present
s were
ld Miss
secretary last
o former secre-
who to the in-
t gro
"Mayflower" group elected
John L. Whitehurst, Balti-
Md., at a con-
vention of last January.
ice had that the
g was in the se-
of that slate was
in of a "rump"
ment.
Nathan's party,
headquarters, Wash-
ington, was Miss Alice
n 1947 for women's
ye. M. now presi-
of the woman's club.
rgan now working
imple equality for
n.

ANUA



Up to the Record Straight

member which is
Nation's Party, this
describ "ins." They're
the Mont House, 144

B-st ne, where they met to scout all this talk
about a NWP "convention" at the Mayflower last
week which elected its own officers. The May-
flower branch branded those in office now as

Women Meeting January 9, 10, 11, 12, 1947 at National Headquarters to Discuss the
Cy Confronting the Organization.

C. H. New York City; Miss Mabel E. Griswold, Wisconsin State Chairman and Secretary of National
founder of National Woman's Party; Mrs. Marie Moore Forrest, D. C., 3rd Vice-
Chairman; Miss Anita Pollitzer, S. C., National Chairman; Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe,
2nd Vice-Chairman; Miss Gladys Houston Greiner, Md., Treasurer; Mrs. Lucia Hanna
Md., Treasurer; Mrs. Theodore Forbes, Md.; Mrs. Mary E. Owens, North Dakota State Chair-
Alabama; Mrs. Helen Vandenberg, Iowa State Chairman; Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, Va.,
Chairman, Industrial Council.
C. Kennedy, Indiana State Chairman; Dr. Alma Jane Speer, D. C.; Mrs. Grace Cook
an; Mrs. Swing, Conn., Northeast Regional Chairman.

s of notices which carried the judge's decision

Miss Pollitzer Ruled Leader Of National Woman's Party

Miss Anita Pollitzer, national chairman of the National Woman's Party and other present incumbents are the legal officers of the party, Associate Justice James M. Proctor ruled in District Court yesterday.

The ruling climaxed a lengthy legal battle between the incumbents and an insurgent group known as the "Mayflower" faction over elective offices.

The "Mayflower" group had elected Mrs. John L. Whitehurst of Baltimore as the chairman at a convention of the group held last January.

Proctor ruled that the meeting which resulted in the selection of the Whitehurst slate was illegal

and in the nature of a "rump" parliament.

The decision meant that the group of officers headed by Miss Pollitzer remains in control of the party headquarters at the Alva Belmont Mansion, 144 B st., ne.

Besides Miss Pollitzer, other officers are: Clara S. Wolfe, Columbus, Ohio, 1st vice-president; Margaret C. Williams, Kent Conn., 2d vice president; Mrs. Randolph Keith Forrest, 1319 34th st. nw., 3d vice president; Mabel E. Griswold, Madison, Wisc., secretary; and Gladys Houston Greiner of Baltimore, treasurer.

Miss Olive Lacey was chief counsel for the Pollitzer slate. Spencer Gordon represented the insurgents.

NOVEMBER 22, 1947.

COURT BACKS AIDES OF WOMAN'S PARTY

Group Is Defeated in Attempt
to Replace Legally Elected
Officers of Organization

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 21.—The title and rights of Miss Anita Pollitzer, chairman, and other incumbent officers of the National Woman's Party, were upheld in a decision handed down today in the Federal Court for the District of Columbia. Judge James M. Proctor ruled illegal the proceedings of the group of party members by whom the action was brought.

In this suit, filed last February in the name of the National Woman's Party, twenty-eight of its officers and council members were cited on the ground that another slate headed by Mrs. John L. Whitehurst of Baltimore had been elected to succeed them at a convention held at the Mayflower Hotel here last January.

The court was asked to decide the validity of this election, disputed by the incumbent officers, and accordingly, the right of Mrs. Whitehurst and her group to possession of Alva E. Belmont House, the national headquarters of the party on Capitol Hill.

Judge Proctor ruled that the Mayflower convention was invalid, in view of the fact that a convention already had been called to meet here last Jan. 25-26 as agreed upon at a council meeting held in New York Sept. 28, 1946. He also ruled that a council meeting subsequently held here Oct. 27, 1946, at which the Mayflower convention was authorized was itself illegal.

Women's Unit Election Held Invalid

Miss Anita Pollitzer of New York city is the legal national chairman of the National Woman's Party, and the convention which elected Mrs. John L. Whitehurst of Baltimore to that office was illegal, according to a decision by Judge James M. Proctor, U. S. District Court, Washington, D. C.

The decision stated further that a national council meeting called last January was illegal. It was at this meeting that a convention was called, and Mrs. Whitehurst subsequently was elected chairman. According to Judge Proctor the convention and the elections that were held are not valid.

The group, headed by Mrs. Whitehurst, was represented by Dean Acheson, former Under Secretary of State. The case has been in court for the past five weeks.

Maryland members of the National Council, declared to be the legal council, are Mrs. Amelia Himes Walker, Mrs. Theodore Forbes, Mrs. Florence Laynor Wheatley, Mrs. Virginia Starr Freedom, Mrs. Alice Minor Kachadourian, Miss Gladys Houston Greiner and Miss Florence Elizabeth Kennard.

Approximately 350 Maryland women are members of the National Woman's Party, which numbers 7,000 members throughout the United States.

BALTIMORE AMERICAN
Sunday, Nov. 23, 1947—

Mrs. Whitehurst "Washes Hands" Of Women's Council

Mrs. John L. Whitehurst, whose election as chairman of the National Woman's Party was declared invalid by a Federal judge in Washington yesterday, declared last night she had "washed her hands" of that organization months ago.

The Baltimore woman, president of the Maryland Women's Council and past president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, explained:

"I never attended a meeting of the organization and have not been connected with it for months in any way at all."

COURT RULING.

Her explanation followed action of Federal Judge James M. Proctor, who ruled that a national council meeting of the National

Woman's Party, called last January, was illegal.

It was at this meeting that a convention at which Mrs. Whitehurst was elected was called.

Judge Proctor ruled that the convention and the election also were illegal.

N. Y. WOMAN CHAIRMAN.

The decision left Miss Anita Pollitzer of New York City, the legal national chairman of the Woman's Party.

Mrs. Whitehurst said she did not attend the convention which elected her.

She said:

"At the time I was approached to become chairman there were two conflicting groups within the organization.

"When I found the groups were irreconcilable, I dropped out."

Statement To Members (Continued from Page 23)

near we were stunned by receiving notice of a Motion for an Injunction, filed in Court on September 10, to restrain the Officers and National Council members from passing on to any new Officers and Council members who might be elected at the Biennial Convention, the seal, property, records, funds, and Headquarters of the organization. In view of this unprecedented action the National Council of the National Woman's Party voted, on September 14, to postpone the Biennial Convention, as it was manifestly impossible to proceed with a Convention in the face of the threat of an Injunction. We know your indignation, and we are deeply sorry for the inconvenience caused our members. Due notice will be sent to members when our lawyers advise that a Convention is practicable."

So there was nothing left now but to face the trial. There was no hesitancy. There was no fear. There was regret that the thirty-five years of unity in the National Woman's Party should be broken in this way. And there was the ever-present, the growing question as to why it was done, what was back of it. The moves of the opposition were still secretive, the identities of the whole group still unknown. Why? That is still to be answered.

THE TRIAL

The long days of the trial began on October 20, 1947. The majority of the crowd in the District Court room where Justice Proctor presided were not the friends of the plaintiffs, but of Alice Paul and Anita Pollitzer, and the other Council members who were being sued. As the days drew on it continued to be the same. Not once did the chairman of the insurgent group, Mrs. John L. Whitehurst, of Baltimore, appear in Court. In fact, her letter of withdrawal from the insurgents was produced in the course of the trial. Nor did their first vice-chairman appear to testify, nor their second vice-chairman, nor their third. Why?

First the plaintiffs presented their evidence. Attorney Spencer Gordon was in charge of the case for the plaintiffs. The trial hinged on the validity of their so-called convention of January 10, 11, 12, 1947. The efforts of the plaintiffs were to the end of establishing that this "convention" was valid. There was tension and often drama in the Court room. But the sympathy was visibly for the defendants.

Those who testified against us were: Mrs.: Caroline Lexow Babcock, D. C.; Miss Laura M. Berrien, D. C.; Miss Gertrude Crocker, Va.; Miss Anna Hogan, N. J.; Mrs. Miriam Oatman, D. C.; Mrs. Margaret Sebree, D. C.; Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, D. C.

For the Defense, it is a different kind of list. Here it is:

NATIONAL OFFICERS AND COUNCIL MEMBERS WHO TESTIFIED FOR US

Miss Anita Pollitzer, S. C., National Chairman
Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio, First Vice Chairman
Miss Mabel E. Griswold, Wis., National Secretary
Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, Va., Virginia State Chairman, Political Chairman
Dr. Mary Sinclair Crawford (Deposition), Calif., Member National Council
Mrs. Lucia Hanna Hadley, Ind., Member National Council and National Executive Council
Miss Elsie Hill, Calif., Past National Chairman
Mrs. Miriam Y. Holden, N. Y., Member National Council
Mrs. Alice Kachadourian, Md., Maryland State Chairman
Mrs. Meta Grace Keebler, Ala., Alabama State Chairman
Miss Mary C. Kennedy, Ind., Indiana State Chairman
Mrs. Grace Cook Kurz, N. Y., Member National Council, Organization Chairman

Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Penna., Member National Council, Congressional Chairman
Mrs. Mamie Sydney Mizen, Wyoming, Member National Council and Wyoming State Committee
Miss Alice Paul, N. J., Founder of Woman's Party, Past National Chairman, and Chairman World Woman's Party
Mrs. Jane Norman Smith, Vt., Past National Chairman, Vermont State Chairman
Mrs. Betty Gram Swing, Conn., Member National Council
Mrs. Helen Vanderburg, Iowa, Iowa State Chairman
Mrs. Amelia Himes Walker, Md., Member National Council, Lobby Chairman
Dr. Agnes E. Wells, Mich., Member National Council, Chairman of College Women's Committee
Mrs. Helen Hunt West, Fla., Member National Council

OTHER WITNESSES WHO TESTIFIED FOR US

Dr. Florence A. Armstrong, Va., Member National Finance Committee
Miss Olive Beal, D. C., Member of Board, D. C. Branch
Miss Jessie H. Dell, D. C., Life Member
Miss Matilda Fenberg, Ill., Legal Counsel of Illinois Branch
Mr. Walter Goldstein, Md., Printer of "Equal Rights"
Mrs. Marie M. Horton, Wyoming, Northwest Regional Chairman
Mrs. Harry Lilly, N. Y., Parliamentarian of National Woman's Party
Mrs. Jennie M. McKibbin, Mich., Director Michigan Branch
Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrell, Fla., Southern Regional Chairman
Mrs. Dora Ogle, Md., Business Manager of "Equal Rights"

AMONG THOSE IN THE COURT ROOM READY TO TESTIFY FOR US BUT OWING TO LACK OF TIME NOT CALLED UPON—

Mrs. Mabel Van Dyke Baer, D. C., District of Columbia Chairman
Mrs. Mamie Florence Bonner, Md., Former Chairman Baltimore Branch
Miss Anne Carter, Texas, Editor "Equal Rights"
Miss Cornelia Carter, Texas, 2nd vice chairman, D. C. Branch
Mrs. Elizabeth Forbes, Md., Member National Council
Mrs. Marie Moore Forrest, D. C., Third Vice Chairman
Mrs. Virginia Starr Freedom, Md., National Press Chairman
Miss Gladys Houston Greiner, Md., National Treasurer
Miss Florence Elizabeth Kennard, Md., Treasurer Defense Fund
Mrs. Mary A. Murray, N. Y., Chairman Industrial Council
Mrs. Ernestine Breisch Powell, Ohio, Second Vice Chairman Ohio Branch
Mrs. George Vickers, N. J., Secretary-Treasurer New Jersey Branch
Mrs. Margaret C. Williams, Conn., Second Vice Chairman
Miss Naomi Wheeler, D. C., Member National Council

Nor is this all. Many, many others would have been glad to testify. In fact, the Judge's wish to shorten our list of witnesses was the only thing that brought the trial to an end. The defendants were eager to proceed with further testimony.

No one in the court room could fail to be impressed by the fact that the defendants and their witnesses were sincere. Many of them had come long distances at their own expense because they wanted to serve the cause of the National Woman's Party. They had nothing to gain personally; indeed they often had much to lose by leaving their normal pursuits. But they were there; they related their stories clearly and with telling effect.

Then came the summation. First, came Attorney Gordon for the plaintiffs; then followed our attorneys: Judge Connaughton, Mr. Conradis, Judge Levitt, and Miss Lacy. They presented an unanswerable array of facts. Miss Lacy made the concluding summation for the Woman's Party. Clearly and simply she led the hearers through each step of the evidence. She pointed out the absence of the so-called "elected" officers from the Court; she called attention to the letter from Mrs.

Whitehurst, whose name had been given in the Complaint as the leader of the insurgents, in which she withdrew from the insurgent group.

Then followed a short rebuttal by the plaintiffs' side, with five new witnesses against us: Mrs. Edith Conway, Mass.; Mrs. Elsie Graff, Va.; Mrs. Page Kirk, D. C.; Mrs. Mary D. McCain, D. C.; Miss Gail Laughlin (Deposition), Maine.

The trial was over. That was November 13, 1947. Soon came the announcement of the decision by Justice Proctor in favor of the defendants. This was handed down November 21, 1947. On December 15, Justice Proctor signed the Judgment in accordance with his decision of November 21.

WHAT WAS BACK OF THE LAW SUIT?

Throughout the progress of this case the mystery of it deepened. From the first, the secrecy surrounding the identities of the actual plaintiffs was present, but there are other questions:

Who authorized the employment of legal service against the regularly elected officers and National Council beginning months before the insurgents' so-called convention of January 10, 11, 12, 1947. Who paid for this legal service?

Who authorized the ultimatum presented on January 21, 1947, to our National Officers and Council by Mr. Spencer Gordon and Mr. Charles A. Horsky of the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, threatening a law suit if the officers and Council did not abdicate?

Who, or what source, was responsible for such costly legal service as the insurgents have had at their command in the present law suit?

Why did the insurgents use the names of members of the National Woman's Party as part of the insurgent group, without their consent, even involving them in the law suit without their knowledge?

These questions are grave enough. But some others not specifically asked are graver. One especially is: What is back of all the attacks on the National Woman's Party during the past year? To try to get an answer to this question, the National Council of the Party drafted the following resolution at a meeting on September 4, 1947, and forwarded it to the Attorney General:

"RESOLVED: That the National Woman's Party request the Attorney General of the United States to recommend that the proper agencies under his supervision investigate to determine whether a concerted effort is now being made by subversive forces to weaken and destroy women's organizations of this Country and the entire Woman Movement, and that a recital of the extraordinary attacks that have been made during the past twelve months upon the National Woman's Party, its officers and National Council, be made to the Attorney General for his information in the matter."

THE FUTURE

This is a report of the most difficult period the National Woman's Party has encountered. But the Woman's Party is more alive than ever. Out of this anxiety and genuine suffering there has grown a deeper bond and a clearer understanding. Those women who came from distances to testify found their tie strengthened, and their loyalty enriched, to all that the Party stands for. Perhaps the whole grim business was the trial by fire which renders out the true gold. That is the earnest wish of the officers of the National Woman's Party in this report to the members.

Tribute To Our Lawyers

By META GRACE KEEBLER,

Alabama Chairman of the National Woman's Party

I feel that I am speaking for the membership of the National Woman's Party in expressing our gratitude to our attorneys for their conscientious, and able work in the case that has just ended in the favorable decision by Justice James Proctor on November 21, 1947.

Miss Olive B. Lacy was our chief counsel. She has long been a member of the National Woman's Party, and was on our legal staff when the Woman's Party made a study of the discriminations against women at the conclusion of the suffrage campaign. She has practiced law in the District of Columbia since she was admitted to the Bar in 1922, and also practices before the Supreme Court of the United States. Miss Lacy was asked to serve as attorney for the National Woman's Party by the National Council at a meeting at National Headquarters in January 1947, at the beginning of the attack against the duly elected officers and council. Since that time Miss Lacy has devoted herself unsparingly to the interests of the National Woman's Party. She has advised at Council meetings and committee meetings, in addition to representing the organization, with marked success, in Court. By the conduct of this case Miss Lacy has earned the admiration of the members of the National Woman's Party throughout the country.

Judge John H. Connaughton, a specialist in corporation law and a former Judge, represented Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, one of the defendants, and aided in the general conduct of the case for all the defendants. Judge Connaughton is not only a prominent attorney, but he is also outstanding in civic affairs of the District of Columbia. At the present time he is President of the Federation of Citizen's Associations of the District. His judgment from the beginning was that the defendants were entirely in the right, legally and morally, and could not lose.

Mr. Albert E. Conradis represented Mrs. Marie Moore Forrest, another of the defendants, and also gave valuable assistance to all the defendants during a period covering many months. Both Judge Connaughton and Mr. Conradis shared with Miss Lacy the questioning and cross-examination of witnesses, and participated most ably in presenting our final argument.

Praise and gratitude go to Judge Albert Levitt of California, who represented his wife, Elsie Hill, a past National Chairman of the National Woman's Party and one of the members of the National Council who was being sued. Judge Levitt left his law practice in California to fly to Washington for the trial. He made one of the leading arguments for the defendants, speaking with eloquence as well as learning. Judge Levitt is a graduate of the Harvard Law School, and has been a Professor of Law at the University of North Dakota and at George Washington University. He was formerly a federal Judge.

Grateful appreciation goes also to Miss Naomi Wheeler, Attorney for the four Interveners who petitioned the Court to strike their names from the record as participants in the insurgent group. She is a member of the Bar of the District of Columbia and of the Supreme Court of the United States. As a member of the National Council of the National Woman's Party, she has given invaluable assistance during these difficult months.

Mrs. Ernestine Breisch Powell, Attorney, of Columbus, Ohio, in order to come to Washington to assist at the trial was obliged to bring with her her three small

(Continued on Page 28)

Memorandum Opinion By Justice James M. Proctor

In Civil Action 530-47 in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, this Memorandum Opinion, printed here in full, was given on November 21, 1947. On December 15 the decision was signed. This decision upheld the incumbent national officers, headed by Miss Pollitzer, and held that the so-called convention of January 10, 11, 12 which had sought to oust these officers was invalid.

The resolution adopted by the council of the National Woman's Party (a corporation) September 28, 1946, providing for a convention to be held at Washington in January, 1947, was a reasonable and sufficient compliance with the constitutional requirement that the council determine the date and place for a national convention. The resolution in such form carried with it implied authority to the national chairman, as chief administrative officer, to select the exact time and place within the terms of the resolution. Although doubtless it was within the power of the council to fix the exact time and place, I do not think the provision should be so strictly construed as to require them to go that far. To do so might lead to the conclusion that a council meeting must not only choose an exact date and geographical spot, but also the very hour and building for the convention. These are incidental details which should fairly fall within the administrative duties of the chairman, if not delegated to others.

Here it appears from the weight of evidence, that there was a general understanding and acquiescence in a proposal made at the meeting that the exact date be left to the officers. This, I think, lends support and authority to the action of the national chairman, after collaboration with the officers and attention to many details, in finally selecting January 25th and 26th at the Mayflower Hotel for the convention. Agreeable to this action a formal call printed in the official organ of the Party was mailed to the members October 28, 1946. The copy for this call was furnished by the chairman to the printer October 14, 1946. The steps thus taken for the convention obtain further support and authority by the National Council at their regular meeting in Indianapolis December 15, 1946. There they adopted a resolution proposed by the Executive Council to postpone the convention from January 25th and 26th to April 12th and 13th. In so doing they tacitly recognized and approved the action which led to setting the convention for January 25th and 26th. Although it is argued that the circumstances precluded the council from ordering the postponement, it seems clear to me that the constitutional power to determine the date and place of a convention carried with it the power to change a time and place previously fixed. For these reasons I hold that the call for January 25th and 26th was valid. It follows that the efforts of the so-called Seabee group to hold a convention January 10th and 11th in Washington were invalid and all action taken by that gathering was void. Accordingly those persons now claiming the offices of the National Woman's Party by action of that meeting are without lawful right or title to support their claims.

The attempted convention lacked the basic support of a valid call, not only because it was in direct conflict with the legally authorized convention call for January 25th, but because the attempted call emanating from the meeting of certain council members of October 27th was a nullity, due to the fact that the meeting itself was illegally convened. The request of ten members for a council meeting upon which the call for the October 27th meeting was made should have been addressed, or at least delivered, to the national chairman, and the call should have been made

or directed by her. Yet it was delivered to the secretary, who assumed the authority to issue the call for a council meeting.

All this was done without the knowledge or approval of the chairman. It gains nothing to argue that it would have been useless to beseech her action. It would have been her duty to act. Had she refused, legal steps could have been taken to compel her to act. As head of the organization and in the absence of any express provision to the contrary she was the proper officer to make the call. The constitution itself in dealing with the subject, although not too clear, does, I think, indicate that calls for meetings of the council should be made by the chairman. Admittedly the chairman and council members of this organization are analogous to the president and directors of a business corporation. As to those the general rule of law requires that under circumstances similar to the ones with which we are now dealing the request for a special meeting should be made to the president and he should issue the call. It is a sound rule, for such procedure would seem essential to assure responsible management of corporate affairs. Any other course would likely lead to conflict and confusion such as has unfortunately developed in the present case. The alleged meeting of the council of January 9th which attempted to bolster the convention for the following day was called in the same way as the meeting of October 27. For similar reasons that meeting was invalid. Also, if it had been legally called its actions were a nullity, for it lacked a quorum to transact business. In my opinion Miss Laughlin did not enjoy the status of a State Chairman; nor can "proxy" voting in behalf of three or four other members be supported by any provisions of the constitution and by-laws, or any general rule of law. Although the proceedings at the convention of January 10th have been severely criticized in many ways, I shall omit dealing with them.

The question as to whether the complaint is in equity or by way of quo warranto may be passed over. It is of no importance in view of the conclusions which have been reached.

Judgment will be entered for the defendants, upon findings of fact and conclusions of law consistent with this opinion.

Tribute To Our Lawyers (Continued)

children. She gave her services without charge, as Chairman of the Lawyers' Council of the National Woman's Party.

We wish also to express gratitude to Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrell, Attorney, of Miami, Florida, Southern Regional Chairman of the National Woman's Party. The trial opened with Mrs. Murrell's plea as an Intervener. Her earnestness and enthusiasm gave a lift to the whole proceeding.

Collector of Port of Pittsburgh Reappointed

Mrs. Elaine Beadling, first woman to hold the position, has been recommended for reappointment as collector of the Port of Pittsburgh. This is the direct result of her exceptionally fine record.

Interveners In The Lawsuit — Civil Action 530-47

ONE of the strangest happenings in the altogether strange law suit in which the National Woman's Party has been involved was the action of those who brought the suit in including in their Complaint the names of certain of our members who had nothing whatever to do with the insurgent group. In this way the impression was given that these members had participated in bringing the suit, while, as a matter of fact, the members concerned had never authorized the use of their names and were actually on the side of those who were being sued. It was even stated in the Complaint that two of these members belonged to the so-called "Executive Council" of the insurgents, which "Executive Council" had engaged the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, "to bring such action or actions as might be necessary . . . to obtain possession of funds, property and records of the Party from any other persons who may be in possession thereof."

Three of the members who had been listed in the Complaint without their consent or knowledge, Mrs. Lucretia Hayden Burwell, Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrell, and Dr. Alma Jane Speer, petitioned the Court to intervene to have their names removed from the Complaint. Each stated in her petition that she supported the group that was being sued. In addition, Mrs. Murrell came to Washington to plead personally in the Court for the removal of her name from the Complaint. Mrs. Mary Stockton Taylor also intervened to ask that her name be removed from the Complaint on the ground that her name had been secured by the insurgent group through misrepresentation.

A memorandum was filed November 19, 1947, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, by Naomi Wheeler, Attorney, in support of the intervention petitions for Mrs. Burwell, Mrs. Murrell, Dr. Speer and Mrs. Taylor. The Memorandum was as follows:

"Interveners Were Listed as Members of Insurgents' Council Without Their Consent, or Through Misrepresentation.

"Interveners M. Lucretia Hayden Burwell and Alma Jane Speer first learned that they had been included in the Insurgents' Council when their names were added to the Complaint in Civil Action 530-47, at the Pre-trial on October 8, 1947. Their names were used as members of the Insurgents' Council, and were used in the Complaint, without their consent and without their knowledge.

"Intervener Ethel Ernest Murrell first learned in February 1947, when the Complaint was filed, that she was listed as a member of the Insurgents' Council, in spite of her refusal of the Insurgents' invitation to serve on their Council. Mrs. Murrell kept up a steady effort to have her name removed from the Insurgents' Council and from the Complaint. She was assured by the leader of the Insurgents, Miss Doris Stevens, and by the attorney for the Insurgents that her name would be removed from the Complaint at the first opportunity. However, instead of removing her name, as promised, Mr. Spencer Gordon, Attorney for the Insurgents, kept her name in the Complaint as a member of the Insurgents' National Council and on October 8, 1947, added her name in the Complaint as a member of the Insurgents' Executive Council.

"Intervener Mary Stockton Taylor became involved in the Insurgents' Council through misrepresentations made to her. She attended the Insurgents' meeting of October 27, 1946, as a result of serious misrepresenta-

tions made to her, but at the first opportunity dissociated herself from the action of the October 27 meeting, by joining in the unanimous vote by the National Council at Indianapolis on December 15, 1946, repudiating the October 27 meeting. She also repudiated the Insurgents' January convention by participating in the action by the National Council January 9, 1947, protesting against the Insurgents' convention and disavowing responsibility for it. Mrs. Taylor gave her name as a member of the Insurgents' Council in January 1947, but this was again the result of gross misrepresentations made to her. She had no idea that she was countenancing the ousting of the existing Council of which she was herself a member.

"Interveners Do Not Wish Property of National Woman's Party Turned Over to Them.

"The interveners wish to state that they do not want to have turned over to them as members of the Insurgents' Council, the assets of the Corporation, as requested in the third Prayer of the Complaint. The interveners wish to point out that the Headquarters Building, Endowment Fund and other properties which the Court is asked to turn over to the Insurgents' Council are valued at nearly half a million dollars. Furthermore, not only do the interveners wish for their own sakes to be completely dissociated from the third Prayer in the Complaint, but they trust that for the sake of the National Woman's Party and the Woman Movement, the Prayer to turn over the property of the National Woman's Party to the Insurgents will not be granted. The Insurgent group does not represent the women who have created and built up the National Woman's Party. They are not the women who have secured the Endowment Fund and the National Headquarters Building and other property, which they are now trying to get under their control. Few of the Insurgent Council members have paid regular membership fees or contributions to the National Woman's Party. One of those on the Insurgents' Council, Miss Kathryn Lewis (daughter of John L. Lewis, the well-known Labor Leader) while prominent in the Labor movement, is entirely unknown in the National Woman's Party and is not even listed as a member at the National Headquarters.

"Interveners Were Elected in October 1945 For Two-Year Term.

"The interveners wish to point out that they were themselves elected in October 1945 for a two-year period as part of the ticket headed by Anita Pollitzer. All four interveners support the group elected at that time headed by Miss Pollitzer, of which they were themselves a part.

"Interveners Believe That Council Elected In October 1945 Is Entitled To Two-Year Term For Which Elected.

"The interveners are united in the belief that those elected to the National Council in October 1945 have the right to serve out the term of office to which they were elected. When the Insurgents first tried to oust the regularly elected Council, the Interveners approved of the peace efforts made by Miss Pollitzer's group, including the move to advance by common consent the date of the Biennial Convention, the incumbent officers being willing to relinquish their offices prior to the expiration of their terms. When peace efforts failed, the interveners felt that the common consent necessary for advancing the Convention no longer existed, and

(Continued on Page 32)

An International Bill Of Rights

By MAMIE SIDNEY MIZEN

The glass-enclosed booths at the end of the great chamber of the United Nations at Lake Success, where representatives of eight sovereign nations sat, enabled us to see clearly the interpreters sending out every word almost instantaneously as it fell from the lips of the speakers. Those words were the beginning of the draft of the Declaration of Human Rights for the United Nations. As we sat there last June, with the headphones over our ears, we could turn a little dial and the whole proceedings came out to us, almost sing-song in Chinese, flowed in liquid Spanish, crackled out in rapid Russian, poured in swift French, in precise English. We had a world in our ears.

Representatives there from the World Woman's Party, one of whom it was my privilege to be, could feel that they were helping to make that new world Bill of Rights. Members of the World Woman's Party had carried the fight for recognition of the rights of women since the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco, when they had triumphantly seen the inclusion of equal rights in that document. They had been present at the Assembly of 1946, when the first draft for a Bill of Rights was presented by the delegate from Panama. This early draft provided against "arbitrary discrimination in the provisions and application of the law because of . . . sex." That left the decision as to what was "arbitrary discrimination" to a court, or other body. That again was battle-ground for the members of the World Woman's Party.

The 1946 Assembly decided to submit the question of a Bill of Rights to the Human Rights Commission. At the initial session of that group there were eighteen people—eighteen not against the gods, but against long ages of voicelessness. Two of these were women, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who was named Chairman of the Commission, and Mrs. Hansa Mehta of India. And the women were divided. Many drafts were presented, for the bodying forth in words of the deepest rights of humankind is no easy task. Mrs. Roosevelt proposed the omission of all questions on woman's status. Mrs. Mehta insisted that the Bill of Rights should contain a guarantee of equality of rights for women. Representatives from the World Woman's Party who were there could feel the tension beneath the quiet flow of words. Enough that the Equal Rights clause was retained, that the Commission voted to keep it in the draft. Victory again. But the fight was to be renewed at the meeting of the drafting sub-committee, to which the whole matter was referred by the full Commission.

It was at the meeting of the sub-committee that we sat there at Lake Success. Quietly in the intervening

months, day by day, World Woman's Party members had been doing their work. It was not the form of the Declaration of Human Rights that concerned them, it was that it contain the idea of no discrimination against women. So we sat there, hearing word by word discussion—clear, incisive statements of the Chinese delegate, quick intervention by the Russian, watching the dignified presentation of the Frenchman, hearing the delegate from Britain state his case. It was a moving experience to know that one was a part

of this historic movement, that women, in the persons of our representatives, were helping to write this Declaration which will, we hope, lift the women of the whole world to full human stature. Suppose such a clause had been in the Bill of Rights of our own United States Constitution—there would have been no need of the long fight for suffrage, for equal nationality rights, for the Equal Rights Amendment, not yet won.

Now the various drafts of the proposed International Bill of Rights have been written and sifted, put into better form. In Geneva, beginning early in the present month of December, will come further consideration by the Human Rights Commission. There are two forms now before the Commission, the full Declaration and a shorter form which is suggested as a convention, or treaty. That would bind its signatories as any other treaty. The words at present proposed are not all we would want. But we have a valiant defender of woman's rights at Geneva, vice-chairman of the World Woman's Party, Miss Louise Van Eeghen, of Doorn, Holland. She is internationally renowned for her work for women and will keep up the good fight at Geneva at the current meeting of the Human Rights Commission.

Let's put down just two articles of the shorter draft. They read:

"Article I—Everyone is entitled to life, liberty and equal protection under the law."

"Article X—Everyone everywhere in the world is entitled to the human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in this Declaration without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. The full exercise of these rights requires recognition of the rights of others and protection by law of the freedom, general welfare and security of all."

The longer Declaration contains the same words. It is not quite enough. We will put all the strength of our thoughts and wishes back of Miss Van Eeghen and her co-workers at Geneva to help them make the woman's rights clause stronger. But it is good to remember that whatever is in that Declaration of Human Rights, is there because your World Woman's Party has never ceased struggling to get it there.

TO ALICE PAUL

Men and women work together,
Side by side they strive together,
Hand in hand they build together,
And so unite the world.

Our valiant leader, Alice Paul,
Harks to freedom's mighty call,
Bids all women stand upright
Enlisting now in liberty's fight.

Women teach our youth today
Right will always win the way,
Break all chains and end all wrong,
Bless the world with love and song.

With lifted head we proudly claim
Life's heritage for which we came
From distant land and foreign shore
That freedom live for evermore.

Unjust laws still exist
Barring women, but we persist
With leaders like our Alice Paul
Who wins by faith and guides us all.

With banners of truth we forge ahead
Remembering what the prophet said,
"Arise and shine,"—this we must do—
Truth is for all and not the few.

Men and women work together,
Side by side they strive together,
Hand in hand they build together
And so unite the world.

By GLADYS HOUSTON GREINER

Organization of 147 Thousand Women Endorses Equal Rights Amendments

The following letter was received at Headquarters:

SUPREME FOREST WOODMEN CIRCLE
Woodmen Circle Building
Omaha, Nebr.

November 10, 1947

Miss Anita Pollitzer, National Chairman,
National Woman's Party,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Miss Pollitzer:

At our recent meeting held in the city of Dallas, Texas, our Board of Directors adopted the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, the Woodmen Circle is a woman's organization and believes that equality of rights under the law should not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex,

"THEREFORE, be it resolved that we go on record as favoring submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women."

With kindest regards and best wishes for the success of your undertaking, we are

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) DORA ALEXANDER TALLEY,
National President

(Signed) CLARA B. CASSIDY,
National Secretary

The Supreme Forest Woodmen Circle is the woman's section of the Woodmen of the World. It has a membership of around 147 thousand, with branches in 47 States. The National Woman's Party is indeed happy to have the backing of this nationwide group for the Amendment.

Michigan

At a recent meeting of the newly formed Alice Paul Chapter of the Michigan Branch, National Woman's Party, which Chapter was organized by Dr. Marie Timpona, of Linvonia Township, Mrs. Phoebe Munnecke, practicing attorney and president of the Michigan Branch spoke. Mrs. Munnecke was one of the White House suffrage pickets and has been active in the cause of women ever since those days.

The following officers of the Alice Paul Chapter were elected: Dr. K. Covert, President; Mrs. Mary Howell, 1st Vice-President; Mrs. Marguerite Meek, 2nd Vice-President; Mrs. Mary Raymond, Recording Secretary; Mrs. Betty Carson, Corresponding Secretary; Mrs. Mary McDowell, Treasurer.

New Jersey Branch

From Jersey City, New Jersey, Mrs. George T. Vickers, Secretary-Treasurer of the New Jersey Branch, writes:

"New Jersey women are in a position to press for an Equal Rights Amendment to the National Constitution, since they have so recently won equality in their State under their own new State Constitution. Women all over the state, under the direction of a state-wide committee called the 'Committee of Forty Thousand,' worked tirelessly for the inclusion in the new constitution of this article guaranteeing equality. They understand the need for the legal recognition of equality between men and women, and think it the height of absurdity for the United States to be supporting equal rights for women in the United Nations and then holding back in Washington."

Other officers of the New Jersey Branch are: Mrs. Ethel M. Adamson, Chairman; Mrs. Lewis Marran, 1st Vice-Chairman, and Mrs. George Miles, 2nd Vice-Chairman.

Appreciation Voiced

New York City
December 1, 1947

To The National Council
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill
Washington, D. C.

I rejoice in the recent victory for your duly elected officers and National Council members in the law suit brought against them.

As the immediate Past President of the National Council of Women of the United States, an organization with an affiliated membership of 5 million women, I have come to know closely and to appreciate the National Woman's Party, which has been one of our member groups for many years.

Soon after suffrage was won, Alice Paul brought the Woman's Party into our organization. Mrs. Jane Norman Smith, a former President of your organization, served for years on the Board of the National Council of Women, giving devoted service. Miss Anita Pollitzer, your President now, has served for many years on our Board as a member at large, and is now so serving. During Miss Pollitzer's term of office most of our Board members have been won over actively to the logic and necessity of the Equal Rights Amendment.

I had planned to come to Washington to testify for you but was unavoidably prevented. I had wanted to do this particularly because I feel that if a small group should succeed in throwing out the duly elected officers in one organization by completely disregarding the orderly conduct of affairs, it would be a threat to all women's organizations. As the co-author of a Handbook for Club Leaders, I have stressed the importance of democratic and orderly procedure in conducting our societies. For that reason I feel great relief over your victory in the Court.

LUCY S. MILLIGAN

(Mrs. Harold V. Milligan)

Honorary President, National
Council of Women,

Vice President, International
Council of Women.

Mrs. Golder Norton Kimmel

On Political Committee

Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, Political Chairman, National Woman's Party, announces that Mrs. Golder Norton Kimmel, D. C., has consented to serve as a member of her Committee. Other members of the Committee are: Mrs. Betty Gram Swing, Vermont, and Mrs. Helen Hunt West, Florida, both of whom have done outstanding work in behalf of the Equal Rights Amendment with political leaders of both parties.

Endorses Amendment

The Society of American Poets at a recent meeting in Maryland, voted unanimously in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment. The National President, Vice-President, and other officers and several members joined the National Woman's Party. Mrs. Virginia Freedom and Miss Gladys Greiner, members of the National Council of the National Woman's Party, were speakers at the meeting at which the endorsement of the Equal Rights Amendment took place.

Maryland State Branch

The Maryland State Branch of the National Woman's Party had a delightful dinner at Pindell Inn, 2420 North Charles Street, Baltimore, on December 2, 1947.

Dr. Florence A. Armstrong, former Finance Chairman, and member of the National Council, came to Baltimore to deliver the main address: "NOW IS THE TIME FOR GREATNESS."

In this Twentieth Century, she said, millions of women are working to change the status of their sex from age-long subjugation to that of equality with men. Our cause demands true greatness of spirit in strategy and in tactics; and we do not have to look far for our example—we have it in the person of Alice Paul.

Dr. Armstrong pointed out that when "greatness" fails, confusion appears; that the test of our cause will come now that we are on the threshold of victory.

Dr. Armstrong's speech was received with applause and appreciation from the large group present at the dinner.

Mrs. Alice M. Kachadourian, State Chairman, welcomed the members and guests. The report of the National Finance Chairman, Mrs. Florence L. Wheatley, was read by Mrs. Virginia Starr Freedom, in Mrs. Wheatley's absence. The finance report was encouraging. Mrs. Mamie Bonner, Membership Chairman, reported a great increase in membership since the organization of the Branch in the early Fall.

Among our visitors were Dr. Mildred Otenasek, Professor of Economics at Trinity College, Washington, D. C., and Mrs. M. Alice Canoles, Democratic National Committeewoman for Maryland.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933 AND JULY 2, 1946.

OF EQUAL RIGHTS, official organ, National Woman's Party, published bi-monthly at Washington, D. C., and printed at 406 W. Redwood St., Baltimore, Md., for September-October, 1947, District of Columbia.

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the District aforesaid, personally appeared Dora G. Ogle, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that she is the Business Manager of the EQUAL RIGHTS publication, and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher and business managers are:

Publisher, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Editor, Anne Carter, 2120 16th St., Washington, D. C.

Business Manager, Dora G. Ogle, 144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

National Woman's Party: National Executive Council—National Chairman, Anita Pollitzer, S. C.; 1st Vice-Chairman, Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio; 2nd Vice-Chairman, Margaret O. Williams, Conn.; 3rd Vice-Chairman, Marie Moore Forrest, D. C.; Secretary, Mabel E. Griswold, Wis.; Treasurer, Gladys Houston Greiner, Md.; Nina Horton Avery, Va.; Cecil Norton Broy, Va.; Lucretia Hayden Burwell, Cal.; Anne Carter, Texas; Lucia Hanna Hadley, Ind.; Emma Guffey Miller, Pa.; Jane Norman Smith, Vt.; Amelia Himes Walker, Md.; Dr. Agnes E. Wells, Mich.; Chairman World Woman's Party, Alice Paul, N. J. National Council (elected and appointed members in addition to those on Executive Council): Ethel M. Adamson, N. J.; Dr. Mary Sinclair Crawford, Cal.; Elizabeth Forbes, Md.; Virginia Starr Freedom, Md.; Miriam Y. Holden, N. Y.; Dr. Zelma Huxtable, Cal.; Alice Kachadourian, Md.; Florence Elizabeth Kennard, Md.; Grace Cook Kurz, N. Y.; Marlon May, N. Y.; Evelyn K. Samras, Fla.; Dr. Alma Jane Speer, D. C.; Betty Gram Swing, Vt.; Helen Hunt West, Fla.; Florence Laynor Wheatley, Md.; Naomi Wheeler, Mich.; Lucy Rice Winkler, Cal.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state). There are none.

DORA G. OGLE, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 17th day of September, 1947. (My commission expires August 18, 1952.)

CHAS. E. ALDEN, Notary Public, D. C.

Interveners In Civil Action (Continued)

that the Council elected in October 1945 must, under the Constitution, be accorded its full term of two years.

"Interveners Are Officials Of Group Headed By Miss Pollitzer.

"Intervener M. Lucretia Hayden is a member of the regular National Council and of the Executive Council headed by Miss Pollitzer. Intervener Alma Jane Speer is a member of the National Council headed by Miss Pollitzer. Intervener Ethel Ernest Murrell is Southern Regional Chairman of the group headed by Miss Pollitzer. Intervener Mary Stockton Taylor is chairman of the Philadelphia Branch, which has taken official action in support of the Council headed by Miss Pollitzer.

"Interveners Object To Being Listed As Part Of Insurgent Group.

"The interveners vigorously object to having been listed in the Complaint as part of the Insurgent group, and consider that they have been put in a most unfortunate light before the membership of the National Woman's Party by being associated in the Complaint with the Insurgents. The Interveners point out that the Insurgent group represents to a large extent the defeated ticket in the 1945 Convention-by-Mail, whereas all of the Interveners were on the successful ticket, headed by Miss Pollitzer. The Interveners consider that the defeated ticket should have waited for the next regular Convention instead of seeking to gain control of the National Woman's Party by a coup d'etat, and they do not wish to be associated in any way with this coup d'etat.

"Interveners Do Not Know Who Is Heading Insurgents' Council.

"The Interveners wish to point out that they do not know who is heading the Insurgents' Council, although they are listed in the Complaint as belonging to that Council.

"Interveners Did Not Authorize Present Law Suit (Civil Action 530-47).

"The interveners wish to state that they knew nothing of the action of the Insurgents in instituting the present law suit until the suit was filed, although they are all listed in the Complaint as members of the Insurgents' National Council. They did not authorize the bringing of the present suit, and they thoroughly disapprove of it."

You, Too, Can Help

This issue of Equal Rights recounts the events of the historic months since our appeal to you in the summer issue. The right has triumphed over determined obstruction.

As our great cause nears victory we cannot expect entire disappearance of obstruction from those who lack understanding of the importance to civilization and peace of elevating the status of women.

We do expect the farsighted, courageous and devoted friends of the cause to help our leaders bear the extraordinary financial burden forced on them at this time.

To enable us to carry on, we now repeat our appeal for aid. Will you not now send us whatever contribution you can, and persuade some other friend of equality also to send a contribution?

Yours faithfully,

FLORENCE LAYNOR WHEATLEY,
Finance Chairman

GLADYS HOUSTON GREINER,
Treasurer

NOTICE

The date on your wrapper is the date of the expiration of your subscription. Send it to us and save our billing you. (Subscriptions are payable in advance.)